

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/349,925	Applicant(s) CHANGEUX ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter Paras, Jr.	Art Unit 1632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Paras, Jr. (3) _____

(2) Timothy Donaldson. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 July 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: 53 and 54 .

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner informed Applicant that the previous Office action mailed on 7/3/02 is vacated in view of the instant Office action. The reasons for vacating the previous Office action are as follows: 1) claims 53-54, directed to transfer of a DNA sequence to a neuronal host cell in vitro, were inadvertently included in the enablement rejection, which is directed to the transgenic mice of the claimed invention; and 2) new arguments were added to the enablement rejection.